

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಂಜುವ್ಯಾಲಪ್ಪಾ.—ಈ 15 ಸೆಲನಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟು!

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I have no information regarding the total number of applications received by the Public Service Commission.

Financial grants to the Municipalities of Mercara and Virajpet.

*Q.—286. Sri K. P. KARUMBAYYA (Virajpet).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether the Municipalities of Mercara and Virajpet have submitted proposals for financial grants to provide adequate supply of drinking water to the citizens ;

(b) if so, whether the same have been sanctioned and if not, the reasons therefor ;

(c) the nature of financial help sought from the Government by the respective Municipalities ;

(d) whether it has come to their notice that due to inadequate supply of drinking water, the citizens are subjected to severe hardships during the months of March, April and May ;

(e) whether they intend to sanction full grants if the repaying capacity of these Municipalities of the loan applied for is lacking in view of their importance of being Tourists Centres ?

A.—**Sri T. SUBRAMANYA** (Minister for Law, Labour and Local Self-Government).—

(a) The scheme for water supply to Mercara Town has not yet been finalised. Hence the question of financial assistance to Mercara Municipality does not arise at present.

Virajpet Municipality has asked for grant of loan.

(b) Receipt of revised plans and estimates for water supply to Mercara Town is awaited from the Chief Engineer (Irrigation and Public Health). Plans and estimates relating to Virajpet Water Supply Scheme have been referred to the Chief Engineer

(Irrigation and Public Health) for scrutiny.

(c) The Virajpet Municipality has asked for a loan of Rs. 7,38,000. In the case of Mercara Municipality the scheme has yet to be finalised as stated in reply to clause (a) above.

(d) There is some amount of hardship, due to inadequate water supply.

(e) Does not arise in view of replies to clauses (a) and (c) above.

Sri K. P. KARUMBAYYA.—Supplementary to (c): may I know whether the Government propose to sanction the loan and if so on what terms ?

†**Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.**—The terms of grant of loan are the financial capacity of the Municipality to repay the loan together with interest at 5 per cent spread over a certain period from 15 to 20 years.

Sri K. P. KARUMBAYYA.—May I know the number of instalments asked for in the particular case ?

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—You are referring to the Virajpet Municipality, I suppose. They have not asked for, in particular, the number of instalments. They have passed a resolution asking or agreeing to take the entire amount of 7,38,000 as loan repayable in 25 instalments.

Sri K. P. KARUMBAYYA.—In view of the foundation stone having been laid as early as May 1957, may I ask that this may be expended as early as possible ?

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—‘As early as possible’ is a very loose phrase. I have no objection to commit myself to that position.

Construction of High Level causeway across Jajur halla in Challakere Taluk.

*Q.—311. Sri T. HANUMAIH (Challakere).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether they have received any representations from the villagers, requesting them to construct a High

Level Causeway across Jajur Halla, in between Nagndonahally and Jajur in Challakere Taluk ;

(b) whether they will take immediate steps to construct the same in view of the difficulties the people are experiencing for want of such a causeway ?

A.—Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Minister for Public Works and Electricity).—

(a) Yes.

(b) This will be considered according to priorities and availability of funds.

ಶ್ರೀ ಐ. ಹನುಮಯ್ಯ.—ಆ ಕಾನ್ವೇ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ರೈಲು ಮತ್ತು ಅನೇಕ ವಾಪಾರಸ್ಥರ ಗಾಡಗಳು ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತುಂಬಾ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೇ ?

ತ್ಯಾಗಿ. ಎಂ. ಎನ್. ನಾಗನೂರ್.—ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಈ ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಕೆಚ್ಚು ಲಾಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸೇತುವೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇದೆಂದು ಅನ್ನಿಸಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಐ. ಹನುಮಯ್ಯ.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಎಸ್ಟಿಪ್‌ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಕಾನ್ವೇ ಹಾಕಲ್ಕು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರೋ ?

Sri M. N. NAGHNOOR.—We will call for preliminary estimates.

Diversion of water from Yagachi Valley to Vedavathi Valley

*Q.—338. **Sri A. R. KARISIDDAPPA** (Arsikere).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether they have received representations from Arsikere Taluk and also from the people of other Taluks to divert water from the people of other Taluks to divert water from Yegachi Valley to Vedavathi Valley ;

(b) why this has not been included under the III Five-Year Plan ?

A.—Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Minister for Public Works and Electricity).—

(a) Yes.

(b) As the diversion of waters from Yagachi River to Vedavathi Valley would be very costly and uneconomical, the proposal has been dropped.

Sri A. R. KARISIDDAPPA.—Supplementary to (b) : The diversion of water from Yagachi to Vedavathi valley—if it is diverted, nearly five taluks will be helped for irrigation. I have already consulted the Engineers and I understand that 45 thousand acres will come under irrigation in Arsikere taluk itself.

MR. SPEAKER.—Please put a question.

Sri A. R. KARISIDDAPPA.—May I know from the Government how this project is considered uneconomical ?

T Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—It is technically not found feasible; to divert the waters of Yegachi valley to Vedavathi valley, it has got to cross the ridge in between the two valleys. It is prohibitively costly. Apart from that, there are other difficulties. When Yagachi has its own irrigable command, it is not correct to divert the waters of one valley for the benefit of the holders of the land in the other valley. Another thing is, Hemavathi is going to be included in the Third Five-Year Plan, and the supplies to Hemavathi will be affected. And the supplies to Krishnarajasagar will also be affected. It is against the standing policy to divert one valley water into another valley unless there is absolutely no irrigable command in that place.

Sri A. R. KARISIDDAPPA.—Are Government aware that the people of Yagachi valley have no objection to the water being diverted to Vedavathi valley ?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—It is not a question of people having objection or no objection. As a matter of policy waters of one valley should not be diverted to another valley unless there is absolutely no irrigable command in that valley.